REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed August 15, 2005.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is amended to delete phrases "such as engine shakes", "such as booming noises" and "such as idling vibration," and to correct minor informalities suggested by the Examiner.

Obviousness Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanahashi (USP'833) and Kojima (USP'720). Claim 1 has been amended, as discussed in detail below. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper if applied to the rejected claims.

In particular, claim 1 is amended to clarify that:

(a) the partition rubber plate is fluid-tightly partition the pressure receiving chamber and the oscillating chamber from each other;

(b) the partition rubber plate and the oscillating rubber elastic plate are disposed in a mutually spaced away relationship, and are moved independently from each other; and

(c) the partition rubber plate faces directly to the pressure receiving chamber.

A basis for the amendment may be found in paragraphs [0034], [0038] and [0042] of the specification, for example. The engine mount comprising the claimed combination, including the features set forth above, can exhibit effective damping performance over a wide frequency range, which is not achieved by the cited references.

In the first place, it is noted that Tanahashi fails to disclose or suggest at least a member corresponding to the aforementioned feature (a), i.e., the partition rubber plate is fluid-tightly partition the pressure receiving chamber and the oscillating chamber from each other. The Examiner contends that the plate spring 70 in the device of Tanahashi anticipates the partition rubber plate recited in Applicant's claim 1. However, it should be noted that the plate spring 70 cannot function as the partition rubber plate recited in claim 1.

First, as can be clearly seen from FIG. 2 of Tanahashi, the plate spring 70 has large openings 72, so that it is impossible for the plate spring 72 to divide the pressure receiving chamber and the oscillating chamber from each other in a fluid-tight manner.

Next, the plate spring 70 is adapted to suspend an oscillating rubber plate 64, and is fixed to the rubber plate 64 at its central portion. Due to the lack of the aforementioned feature (b) of the present invention, then, the plate spring 70 moves with the rubber plate 64. In other words, the plate spring 70 and the rubber plate 64 do not move separately at different frequencies in order to exhibit different frequency vibrations, while the recited subject matter can achieve this at least in part by means of the feature (b).

Finally, Tanahashi fails to disclose the partition rubber plate (the plate spring 70) facing directly to the pressure-receiving chamber. Namely, the plate spring 70 faces to the pressure-receiving chamber via the orifice passage 88. Due to lack of the aforementioned feature (c) recited in Applicant's claims, the plate spring 70 cannot function to absorb the pressure in the pressure-receiving chamber when the orifice passage 88 is in a substantially closed state. Conversely, according to the presently-recited subject matter including the feature (c), it is possible to exhibit a damping effect owing to the displacement of the partition rubber plate, even if the orifice passage is in a closed state.

In conclusion, then, both of the cited references (Tanahashi and Kojima) lack at least one element recited in Applicant's claims, i.e., the partition rubber plate having at least all of the aforementioned features (a)-(c). For at least this reason, then, the subject matter recited in amended claim 1 (and claims 2 and 3, depending from claim 1) is neither anticipated by Tanahashi, nor would have been obvious over Tanahashi taken in view of Kojima.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Alan S. Hodes
Reg. No. 38,185

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300